

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 12-1232**September Term, 2012**

FERC-76FR49842
FERC-RM10-23-000
FERC-RM10-23-001
FERC-RM10-23-002

Filed On: March 5, 2013

South Carolina Public Service Authority,
Petitioner

v.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
Respondent

Alabama Public Service Commission, et al.,
Intervenors

Consolidated with 12-1233, 12-1250, 12-1276,
12-1279, 12-1280, 12-1285, 12-1292,
12-1293, 12-1296, 12-1299, 12-1300,
12-1304, 12-1448, 12-1478

BEFORE: Griffith and Kavanaugh, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the joint proposal of petitioners and intervenors to establish a format and schedule for briefing, it is

ORDERED that the following briefing format and schedule shall apply:

Petitioners' Brief Concerning Statement of the Case, Statement of Facts, and Standards of Review (not to exceed 6,750 words)	May 28, 2013
---	--------------

Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of Petitioners' Joint Brief Concerning Threshold Issues (not to exceed 9,450 words)	May 28, 2013
--	--------------

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 12-1232**September Term, 2012**

Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support
of Petitioners' Joint Brief Concerning Cost
Allocation
(not to exceed 9,450 words)

May 28, 2013

Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of
Petitioners' Joint Brief Concerning Right of
First Refusal
(not to exceed 8,550 words)

May 28, 2013

Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of
Petitioners' Joint Brief Concerning
Transmission Planning and Public Policy
(not to exceed 3,600 words)

May 28, 2013

State Petitioners' and State Intervenors'
Brief Concerning State Sovereignty
(not to exceed 2,000 words)

May 28, 2013

Petitioners' Brief Concerning Reciprocity
(not to exceed 2,000 words)

May 28, 2013

Petitioners' Brief Concerning FPA § 211A
(not to exceed 2,000 words)

May 28, 2013

Petitioner ITC Companies' Brief
Concerning Scope of Cost Allocation
(not to exceed 4,500 words)

May 28, 2013

Respondent's Brief
(not to exceed 47,700 words)

September 25, 2013

Intervenors in Support of Respondent's
Brief Concerning Threshold Issues, Cost
Allocation, Transmission Planning and Public
Policy, and State Sovereignty
(not to exceed 7,800 words)

October 16, 2013

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 12-1232**September Term, 2012**

Intervenors in Support of Respondent's Brief Concerning Right of First Refusal (not to exceed 3,200 words)	October 16, 2013
Intervenors in Support of Respondent's Brief Concerning Scope of Cost Allocation (not to exceed 2,000 words)	October 16, 2013
Municipal and Cooperative Intervenors in Support of Respondent's Brief Concerning FPA § 211A (not to exceed 2,000 words)	October 16, 2013
Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of Petitioners' Joint Reply Brief Concerning Threshold Issues (not to exceed 4,725 words)	November 15, 2013
Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of Petitioners' Joint Reply Brief Concerning Cost Allocation (not to exceed 4,725 words)	November 15, 2013
Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of Petitioners' Joint Reply Brief Concerning Right of First Refusal (not to exceed 4,275 words)	November 15, 2013
Petitioners' and Intervenors in Support of Petitioners' Joint Reply Brief Concerning Transmission Planning and Public Policy (not to exceed 1,800 words)	November 15, 2013
State Petitioners' and State Intervenors' Reply Brief Concerning State Sovereignty (not to exceed 1000 words)	November 15, 2013

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 12-1232**September Term, 2012**

Petitioners' Reply Brief Concerning
Reciprocity
(not to exceed 1000 words)

November 15, 2013

Petitioners' Reply Brief Concerning
FPA § 211A
(not to exceed 1000 words)

November 15, 2013

Petitioner ITC Companies' Reply Brief
Concerning Scope of Cost Allocation
(not to exceed 2,250 words)

November 15, 2013

Deferred Appendix

December 6, 2013

Final Briefs

December 13, 2013

The parties will be notified by separate order of the oral argument date and composition of the merits panel. The court reminds the parties that

In cases involving direct review in this court of administrative actions, the brief of the appellant or petitioner must set forth the basis for the claim of standing. . . . When the appellant's or petitioner's standing is not apparent from the administrative record, the brief must include arguments and evidence establishing the claim of standing.

See D.C. Cir. Rule 28(a)(7).

Parties are strongly encouraged to hand deliver the paper copies of their briefs to the Clerk's office on the date due. Filing by mail may delay the processing of the brief. Additionally, counsel are reminded that if filing by mail, they must use a class of mail that is at least as expeditious as first-class mail. See Fed. R. App. P. 25(a). All briefs and appendices must contain the date that the case is scheduled for oral argument at the top of the cover. See D.C. Cir. Rule 28(a)(8).

Per Curiam